

**United States District Court
Southern District of Texas
Victoria Division**

STATE OF TEXAS, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, *et al.*,
Defendants;.

Case 6:23-cv-7

TEXAS’S SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT

Texas, Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia supplements the Amended Complaint, ECF 20, with these allegations and claims for relief that have arisen since the filing of that pleading.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

1. Except that this Supplemental Complaint is brought only by certain of the Plaintiff States, the parties, jurisdiction, and venue are as identified and alleged in the Amended Complaint, ECF 20.

FACTS

2. The Defendants have, since even before the January 30, 2023, announcement that the Title 42 policy would be shuttered,¹ anticipated a surge in illegal immigration at the Southwestern Border of the United States as a result of

¹ OMB, *Statement of Administration Policy: H.R. 382 and H.J. Res. 7* (Jan. 30, 2023), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/SAP-H.R.-382-H.J.-Res.-7.pdf> (announcing White House plan to let public health emergency expire on May 11).

that shuttering.² Prudent parties would have acted quickly to mitigate that surge, and quick action was possible—indeed, between the announcement of the expiration of Title 42 and the actual expiration at midnight on May 12, 2023, the Defendants managed to propose, take comments on, and finalize another rule geared in part toward mitigating the expiration’s effects. *See* Circumvention of Lawful Pathways, 88 Fed. Reg. 11,704 (proposed Feb. 23, 2023) (to be codified at 8 C.F.R. pts 208 and 1208); Circumvention of Lawful Pathways (May 10, 2023) (unpublished final rule) (to be published on May 16, 2023), <https://public-inspection.federalregister.gov/2023-10146.pdf>.

3. When presented with the choice, however, the Defendants chose dithering over acting—and dithering, not perfecting, is what it was. At nearly the literal eleventh hour—on May 10, fewer than 48 hours before Title 42 was to expire—they issued a memo adopting an unlawful policy on which the public never had the chance to comment and that did not consider all the relevant factors or possibilities for action. *See* Ex. A. That memo, issued by the Chief of the U.S. Border Patrol,³ a component of Defendant U.S. Customs and Border Patrol, explains how CBP will exercise its alleged parole authority under Section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5), to release illegal aliens arriving at the Southwest Border into the United States. Exh. A. It calls this policy “Parole with Conditions.” Though there are several alternative conditions precedent to use of the policy, they are almost certain to occur. For example, one such condition is that Border Patrol have “apprehended 7,000 noncitizens per day across the [Southwest

² *See* Press Release, DHS Continues to Prepare for End of Title 42; Announces New Border Enforcement Measures and Additional Safe and Orderly Processes (Jan. 5, 2023).

³ This position has two titles—the office of Border Patrol Chief is also an Executive Assistant Commissioner of CBP.

Border] over a 72-hour period,” Exh. A at 4, a condition that the memo admits had been met over at least each of the 4 previous days. *Id.* at 7.

4. Under the policy, Defendants will “parole” otherwise illegal immigrants into the United States after an “individual assessment” that will include, among other things, a “biometric identity verification”; an evaluation of the alien’s “immigration background”; and “vetting for any national security or criminal concerns”. *Id.* at 5-6. The policy requires Border Patrol to collect and document a physical address but does not appear to require any verification of the legitimacy of the address provided. The alien is required to schedule an appointment with ICE for the initiation of immigration proceedings but may go online to request an NTA by mail. *Id.* at 2. However, the grant of parole under the policy does not place any restrictions on where the alien may go or require electronic monitoring or any other means to track the alien’s location once released. The “initial” grant of parole “should generally be for 60 days”, but apparently the parole grant may be extended or renewed without limitation. *Id.* at 5

5. No notice or comment was provided as to this policy as required by the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), ostensibly because conditions at the Southwest Border are “quickly evolving into exigent circumstances” and “urgent action” is required. The policy, however, does not claim these circumstances were unexpected or explain why the policy was announced only at the last day before the Title 42 Order was to end.

6. The Parole with Conditions policy does not require an individualized showing or determination on a case by case basis that each person paroled has urgent humanitarian reasons for his or her parole, or that such parole of that individual will result in a significant public benefit, all as required by Section 212(d)(5). Nor does it contemplate how paroled aliens will be returned to custody once the parole expires or its purposes have been served, also as required by Section 212(d)(5).

7. The Parole with Conditions policy will cause the States immediate and irreparable harm for which it has no adequate remedy at law. By unlawfully releasing illegal aliens into the States under this policy, the Defendants will damage them by inflicting on them costs for public education, law enforcement and incarceration, unreimbursed health care, and other public services for such illegal aliens, in addition to those already inflicted as described in the Amended Complaint. These harms will be substantial, both to the States' sovereignty and to the public fisc, and cannot be undone through monetary remedies. And these harms are not limited to aliens released directly into a Plaintiff State; once paroled, these illegal aliens are released into the United States without restrictions as to where they may go and without monitoring or other safeguards to track their whereabouts.

8. The Parole with Conditions policy includes little or no consideration of vital matters such as:

- How the Defendants can realistically determine whether persons considered for parole under "exigent circumstances" are risks to national security or pose risks of committing serious crimes in the United States;
- How illegal aliens paroled into the United States who break their promise to appear can be located, apprehended, and removed;
- Alternatives to this almost literal catch-and-release program;
- Whether and to what extent the policy creates incentives for even more illegal aliens to travel to the Southwest Border, not only further increasing the number—and perhaps rate—of illegal immigrants entering the country but in fact exacerbating the very "exigent circumstances" the policy is designed to combat.

9. Immediate injunctive relief by way of temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction is necessary to protect the States from threatened immediate and irreparable harm. That relief is warranted because they are substantially likely

to prevail on the merits at trial; their injuries are irreparable; and the public interest and balance of the equities favor them.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

I. Count Three (APA)

10. The Parole with Conditions policy violates the APA because it is not in accordance with law and is in excess of Defendants' statutory authority or applicable limitations, or short of statutory right. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

11. The policy and its implementation and operation violate the Immigration and Naturalization Act, including 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b), 1226(a), and 1182(d)(5).

II. Count Four (APA)

12. The Parole with Conditions policy violates the APA because it is arbitrary and or capricious, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

13. The Defendants did not consider all reasonable alternatives to the policy. For instance, they did not consider expanding the Migrant Protection Protocols to increase the number of illegal aliens required to remain in Mexico while immigration proceedings are pending.

14. Nor did the Defendants consider the reliance interests implicated by the policy and the costs it would impose on third parties such as the States and the individuals who are directly and indirectly harmed by the increased amount of illegal immigration the policy facilitates creates incentives to continue of increase—for example, the depressing of wages resulting from adding tens of thousands of new persons to the workforce per month, the damage to private and government-owned property caused by additional trespassing by those responding to the incentives the policy creates, and the additional victimization of illegal aliens themselves by the “middlemen” whose “facilitation” of travel to the Southwest Border is better known

by the terms blackmail, kidnapping, sexual assault, physical violence, and hostage-taking.

III. Count Five (APA)

15. The Parole with Conditions policy is a substantive rule subject to the APA's notice and comment requirements of the APA. 5 U.S.C. § 553.

16. Though no applicable exception allowed them to do so, the Defendants promulgated and adopted the policy without the required notice and comment.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

For these reasons, the States respectfully request that the Court:

- Temporarily restrain or stay, and preliminarily enjoin, the Defendants' implementation and operation of the Parole with Conditions program;
- Following a trial on the merits, decree that the Parole with Conditions program was adopted in violation of the APA and vacate it, set it aside, or in the alternative, permanently enjoin the Defendants from operating it;
- Declare that the Parole with Conditions program exceeds the Defendants' statutory parole authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5);
- Award the States their attorneys' fees and costs of court; and
- Award the States all other relief to which they may be entitled.

Dated May 12, 2023.

Respectfully submitted.

KEN PAXTON
Attorney General of Texas
BRENT WEBSTER
First Assistant Attorney General
GRANT DORFMAN
Deputy First Assistant Attorney
General
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
(512) 463-1700

AARON F. REITZ
Lead Counsel
Deputy Attorney General for Legal Strategy
Texas Bar No. 24105704
Southern District of Texas No. 3653771
aaron.reitz@oag.texas.gov

/s/ Leif A. Olson
LEIF A. OLSON
Chief, Special Litigation Division
Texas Bar No. 24032801
Southern District of Texas No. 33695
leif.olson@oag.texas.gov

RYAN D. WALTERS
Special Counsel
Texas Bar No. 24105085
Southern District of Texas No. 3369185
ryan.walters@oag.texas.gov

DAVID BRYANT
Special Counsel
Texas Bar No. 03281500
Southern District of Texas No. 808332
david.bryant@oag.texas.gov

GENE P. HAMILTON
America First Legal Foundation
Virginia Bar No. 80434
Southern District of Texas No. 3792762
300 Independence Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 964-3721
gene.hamilton@aflegal.org

Counsel for the State of Texas

STEVE MARSHALL
Alabama Attorney General
EDMUND G. LACOUR JR.
Solicitor General
Office of the Attorney General
State of Alabama
501 Washington Avenue
P.O. Box 300152
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-0152
Tel: (334) 242-7300
Edmund.LaCour@AlabamaAG.gov
Counsel for the State of Alabama

BRENNA BIRD
Attorney General of Iowa
ERIC H. WESSAN
Solicitor General
1305 E. Walnut Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Tel: (515) 281-5164
Fax: (515) 281-4209
eric.wessan@ag.iowa.gov
Counsel for the State of Iowa

DANIEL CAMERON
Attorney General of Kentucky
MARC MANLEY
Associate Attorney General
Kentucky Office of the Attorney General
700 Capital Avenue, Suite 118
Frankfort, Kentucky
Tel: (502) 696-5478
Counsel for the Commonwealth of Kentucky

TIM GRIFFIN
Arkansas Attorney General
NICHOLAS J. BRONNI
Arkansas Solicitor General
HANNAH L. TEMPLIN
Assistant Solicitor General
Office of the Arkansas Attorney
General
323 Center Street, Suite 200
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
Counsel for the State of Arkansas

KRIS KOBACH
Attorney General of Kansas
JESSE A. BURRIS, Kan. Sup. Ct.
#26856
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Kansas Attorney General
120 SW 10th Avenue, 2nd Floor
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1597
Tel: (785) 368-8197
Jesse.Burris@ag.ks.gov
Counsel for the State of Kansas

JEFF LANDRY
Attorney General of Louisiana
ELIZABETH B. MURRILL (La #20685)
Solicitor General
JOSEPH SCOTT ST. JOHN (La #36682)
Deputy Solicitor General
Louisiana Department of Justice
1885 N. Third Street
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
Tel: (225) 326-6766
murrille@ag.louisiana.gov
stjohnj@ag.louisiana.gov
Counsel for the State of Louisiana

LYNN FITCH
Attorney General of Mississippi
JUSTIN L. MATHENY
Deputy Solicitor General
Office of the Mississippi Attorney General
P.O. Box 220
Jackson, MS 39205-0220
Tel: (601) 359-3680
justin.matheny@ago.ms.gov
Counsel for the State of Mississippi

DAVE YOST
Ohio Attorney General
SYLVIA MAY MAILMAN
Ohio Deputy Solicitor General
30 E. Broad St., 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
Tel: (614) 466-8980
May.Mailman@OhioAGO.gov
Counsel for the State of Ohio

JONATHAN SKRMETTI
Tennessee Attorney General
and Reporter
CLARK L. HILDABRAND
Assistant Solicitor General
P.O. Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202
Tel: (615) 253-5642
Clark.Hildabrand@ag.tn.gov
Counsel for the State of Tennessee

ANDREW BAILEY
Attorney General of Missouri
JOSHUA M. DIVINE, Mo. Bar #69875
Solicitor General
CHARLES F. CAPPS, Mo. Bar #72734
Deputy Solicitor General
Missouri Attorney General's Office
Post Office Box 899
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
Tel: (573) 751-8870
Josh.Divine@ago.mo.gov
Counsel for the State of Missouri

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General of South Carolina
THOMAS T. HYDRICK
Assistant Deputy Solicitor General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211
Tel: (803) 734-4127
thomashydrick@scag.gov
Counsel for the State of South Carolina

PATRICK MORRISEY
Attorney General of West Virginia
LINDSAY SEE
Solicitor General
MICHAEL R. WILLIAMS
Senior Deputy Solicitor General
Office of the West Virginia
Attorney General
State Capitol, Bldg 1, Room E-26
Charleston, WV 25305
Tel: (681) 313-4550
Lindsay.S.See@wvago.gov
Michael.R.Williams@wvago.gov
Counsel for the State of West Virginia

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

On May 12, 2023, Defendants' counsel Erez Reuveni informed Texas's counsel that the Defendants oppose this motion. Texas's counsel did not receive a response from the Intervenor Defendants' counsel before filing.

/s/ Leif A. Olson
LEIF A. OLSON

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on, this May 12, 2023, this supplemental complaint was filed through the Court's CM/ECF system, which served it upon all counsel of record.

/s/ Leif A. Olson
LEIF A. OLSON

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20229



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

HQBOR 90/16.38

MAY 10 2023

TO: All Chief Patrol Agents
All Directorate Chiefs

MEMORANDUM FROM: Raul L. Ortiz [REDACTED]
Chief
U.S. Border Patrol

SUBJECT: Policy on Parole with Conditions in Limited Circumstances
Prior to the Issuance of a Charging Document (Parole with
Conditions)

To outline how U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) utilizes the longstanding authority under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5), to temporarily parole certain noncitizens on a case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or for significant public benefit. This memorandum describes the policy when that authority may, in certain circumstances, be used to consider individuals for parole after United States Border Patrol (USBP) has conducted an inspection of the noncitizen and prior to the issuance of a charging document where that parole is subject to the imposition of conditions on parole, as contemplated in the INA (hereinafter, Parole with Conditions). Specifically, this policy addresses when parole is conditioned on a noncitizen, within 60 days, scheduling an appointment to appear at an U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) facility for the initiation of appropriate removal proceedings or requesting service, via a designated online location, of a Notice to Appear (NTA) by mail. This document describes the general policy of when such paroles may be considered and continues to require that each parole be considered individually, based on the facts and circumstances known to the Border Patrol Agent (BPA) at the time of processing. All paroled noncitizens will go through appropriate vetting and national security checks.

USBP conducts an inspection of each noncitizen it apprehends or arrests consistent with its authorities, including INA § 287, 8 U.S.C. § 1357 and INA § 235(a), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a), often referred to as "processing." Processing noncitizens includes steps such as, among other things, identification of the noncitizen, review of immigration and criminal history, an assessment of any national security concerns, and an individualized evaluation of what processing pathway is most appropriate for the individual noncitizen, such as removal proceedings under INA § 240, 8 U.S.C. § 1229a; expedited removal; reinstatement of removal; permitting the individual to voluntarily withdraw their application for admission; and/or parole. This policy provides general guidance on when BPAs may consider parole for an individual who the agent expects is otherwise amenable for removal proceedings under INA § 240, 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. This

EXHIBIT A

Policy on Parole with Conditions
Page 2

memorandum in no way removes agents' discretion to examine all appropriate processes for any particular noncitizen.

Pursuant to section 212(d)(5)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A), the Secretary of Homeland Security has the discretionary authority to parole applicants for admission into the United States "temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe only on a case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit." As part of an overall inspection of a noncitizen under INA § 235(a), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a), CBP may exercise its discretion to parole a noncitizen on a case-by-case basis into the United States, including during the initiation of or to facilitate ICE's initiation of removal proceedings under section 240 of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Parole with Conditions provides a processing mechanism to allow for more expeditious processing of individuals who agents determine would be appropriate for section 240 removal proceedings.

This memorandum describes a policy concerning when CBP may exercise its discretionary parole authority for urgent humanitarian reasons or a significant public benefit, including where there are conditions requiring the expeditious processing of noncitizens in exigent circumstances in order to ensure (1) appropriate and safe conditions for the health and safety of individual noncitizens in custody and (2) USBP's continued ability to carry out its critical border security and enforcement mission. During periods of sustained high encounter numbers, it is significantly more efficient for USBP to process individuals, consistent with INA § 235(a), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a), for Parole with Conditions as opposed to issuing an NTA or other charging document at the time of encounter. Those subject to Parole with Conditions are not simply released into the community; they are required to schedule an appointment with ICE for the initiation of section 240 removal proceedings, as appropriate, or, at a designated online location, request service of an NTA by mail.

Parole with Conditions is a tool that should only be used when one of the limited triggers below are met and only on a case-by-case individualized review of each noncitizen. Parole with Conditions permits CBP to prioritize the health and safety of individual noncitizens in its custody through reducing overcrowding, and to maintain adequate enforcement resources along the border to deter the efforts of criminal organizations and traffickers and intercept persons seeking to enter the United States unlawfully. It also allows for USBP to maintain safe and humane holding conditions, compliant with all applicable court orders and other legal obligations, for each noncitizen in its custody. It should be used only where USBP determines that there are urgent humanitarian reasons that warrant parole of a particular person, given the health and safety of individuals in custody, or that there is significant public benefit in paroling the particular person in order to allow for USBP to continue to process those it has in its custody or utilize its limited personnel to process and maintain border security.

Parole with Conditions will be utilized with the other steps USBP has already taken to ensure that processing is as efficient as possible. For instance, USBP has streamlined the NTA/on own recognizance (OR) process, while ensuring legal sufficiency for processing. Moreover, USBP has taken steps to automate the A-file processes and to make forms electronic where possible to further reduce processing times. With the rollout of mobile field processing, USBP has further provided agents with tools to improve processing times. Additionally, adding Border Patrol

Policy on Parole with Conditions
Page 3

Processing Coordinators who perform administrative work in supporting BPAs and engaging in a contract for data entry processors has allowed USBP to focus its BPA time and resources to its important border mission and immigration officer functions. USBP has taken steps to increase its short-term holding capacity. For example, USBP has opened new soft sided facilities and other facilities that allow for initial processing outside USBP stations. USBP continues to use all of its resources to achieve its mission needs, using remote agents for virtual processing, while also receiving assistance where available, from the immigration officers in Office of Field Operations for their processing of noncitizens on the Southwest border (SWB), the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Volunteer Force, which permits federal employees to assist CBP in processing noncitizens along the SWB, and utilizing Department of Defense personnel to assist in non-immigration officer functions, such as data entry and warehouse duties.

Notwithstanding these efforts, USBP's resources, including personnel and physical space and equipment, are finite. USBP still needs additional mechanisms to ensure that individual noncitizens are processed expeditiously and released from or transferred out of USBP custody in a safe, swift, humane, and orderly fashion, in order to provide for appropriate and safe conditions for noncitizens.

It is the policy of CBP and USBP to hold noncitizens in appropriate short-term holding conditions upon apprehension, consistent with all applicable court orders and other legal obligations. It is important to ensure that conditions of short-term custody are appropriate for the nature and length of detention. USBP makes every effort to hold noncitizens for the least amount of time required for their processing, transfer, release, or repatriation as appropriate and as operationally feasible. This is because, as USBP's facilities reach capacity, it becomes more difficult to ensure the safety, health, and security of individual noncitizens, monitor medical needs, sanitation, mental health considerations, and other important factors for appropriate short-term custody conditions.

CBP understands that the DHS Office of Health Security has assessed that efforts to reduce overcrowding in DHS facilities to avoid preventable harm and mitigate health and welfare risks to both noncitizens and the DHS workforce should be prioritized.

Moreover, there are requirements such as *Flores*, regarding treatment of minors in DHS custody, and *Doe*, requiring certain detention conditions for those in custody longer than 48 hours in the Tucson sector, which mandate particular conditions for those in CBP custody. USBP recognizes that short-term custody conditions may have a disproportionate impact on different populations such as those with medical conditions or other vulnerabilities. Therefore, it is USBP's policy to apply the most appropriate processing pathway for an individual noncitizen, taking into account all appropriate factors including short-term holding conditions and the impact of conditions that could potentially impact the safety, health, and security of noncitizens in CBP custody.

Approval Process

Use of Parole with Conditions is not authorized unless it is specifically requested by a sector and authorized by the CBP Commissioner. In no circumstance does the authorization to apply Parole with Conditions for a particular sector mean that all noncitizens in a particular sector should be

Policy on Parole with Conditions
Page 4

paroled. Instead, it simply authorizes the BPA inspecting an individual noncitizen to consider one of several processes. As explained more fully below, the decision to parole a noncitizen must still be made on a case-by-case individualized basis, examining all of the facts and circumstances at the time of the noncitizen's inspection, and only if there is an urgent humanitarian reason, such as ensuring the safety, health, and security of the individual noncitizen, or significant public benefit justifying parole.

A sector may request authorization for the use of Parole with Conditions on a case-by-case individualized basis from the Commissioner due to exigent circumstances if one of the following exists:

- A sector or centralized processing center's (CPC) capacity in custody total exceeds 125%; OR
- USBP has apprehended 7,000 noncitizens per day across the SWB over a 72-hour period; OR
- The average time-in-custody (TIC) for noncitizens is over 60 hours.

Use of Parole with Conditions is only authorized during exigent circumstances, and as such may only be utilized to the extent necessary. If a sector or CPC reaches 95% capacity, then Parole with Conditions should not be utilized in that sector and other Title 8 processing pathways should be utilized. Once a sector or CPC is at 95% capacity, the concerns regarding health and safety of noncitizens in short-term custody are more likely mitigated for the reasons discussed below.

Based on USBP's long experience and expertise, USBP expects that the circumstances listed above reflect situations where it will become increasingly difficult for USBP to process noncitizens as quickly as they are apprehended while ensuring that custody conditions are consistently safe, humane, and orderly and consistent with applicable court orders and other legal obligations.

As short-term holding conditions become more crowded, USBP faces increasing challenges regarding maintenance of sanitation, medical needs, and mental health of noncitizens, among other short-term custody standard considerations. These circumstances do not require the parole of any particular noncitizen but instead are factors considered that USBP determines it is appropriate to request the use of Parole with Conditions from the Commissioner for urgent humanitarian reasons in addition to considering other processing pathways. Moreover, short-term custody conditions remain only one factor in the determination to parole. As discussed above, USBP continues to fully assess each individual on a case-by-case basis to determine the best processing pathway for that particular individual.

Approval of Parole with Conditions may be granted only on a sector-by-sector basis, and Parole with Conditions may not be used for noncitizens transferred laterally from a sector that has not met the threshold criteria above. Additionally, approval for use of Parole with Conditions is time limited, must be reassessed every week by the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner, and is expected to be used sparingly even when approved. Lastly, CBP must obtain a valid mailing address using an address validation tool for every noncitizen paroled under this authority.

Policy on Parole with Conditions
Page 5

Nongovernmental organization and shelter addresses are not sufficient for a noncitizen address. USBP is not authorized to process noncitizens via Parole with Conditions when these criteria are not met, and when a sector or CPC is below 95% capacity, absent extraordinary circumstances as determined by the Commissioner.

The initial grant of Parole with Conditions should generally be for 60 days, for the purpose of allowing the noncitizen to schedule an appointment to appear at an ICE facility for the initiation of appropriate removal proceedings or to request service of an NTA by mail, via a designated online location. Parole is automatically terminated upon expiration of the period for which parole was authorized.

Individual Assessment

Each noncitizen is individually processed consistent with INA § 235(a), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a), after encounter. This inspection process includes, but is not limited to, an assessment of the individual's identification and immigration background, review and vetting of any national security or criminal concerns, and consideration of which immigration processing pathway is best applicable to the noncitizen. This memorandum describes when Parole with Conditions may be appropriate in advance of the issuance of an NTA where the BPA expects that section 240 removal proceedings is likely the appropriate pathway.

Once the Parole with Conditions initial criteria are met, the decision to parole any individual noncitizen must be assessed on a case-by-case, individualized basis.

Prior to a noncitizen's processing via Parole with Conditions, CBP must conduct biometric identity verification. The BPA making determinations regarding Parole with Conditions must evaluate any potential national security and public safety concerns. Any assessment must consider all of the facts and circumstances known to the BPA at the time, including but not limited to, the noncitizen's immigration history, criminal history, community or family ties, medical concerns, role as a caregiver or provider, and other factors known to the BPA. The assessment may begin as early as the initial encounter in the field, and there is no limitation on the time period in which this individual evaluation must occur. BPAs must make determinations about national security and public safety based on the facts and circumstances known at the time of processing.

In addition, the BPA must consider whether, given the time the individual has been in custody, and the availability of ICE detention space, there is an urgent humanitarian reason or significant public benefit to parole the individual from custody, such as where a noncitizen has medical, mental health, or other care needs that cannot reasonably be provided in USBP custody given the prolonged time in custody due to encounter numbers. Additionally, because BP personnel and resources are finite, BP must consider whether processing personnel and resources are necessary to process other noncitizens in BP custody or accomplish enforcement actions that are immediately critical to border security for the greater public benefit. If so, the individual may be considered for Parole with Conditions.

Policy on Parole with Conditions
Page 6

USBP must collect and document a physical address for each noncitizen processed via parole with Conditions. In doing so, USBP is making a determination to temporarily pause the completion of the paperwork necessary for the initiation of removal proceedings under INA § 240, 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, which will instead be completed at a later date. It is expected that the individual noncitizen would receive the same initiation of removal proceedings pursuant to INA § 240, 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, regardless of whether the completion of that paperwork was to occur.

Cases in Which Parole with Conditions May Not Be Utilized

Parole with Conditions may not be used for noncitizens who, based on an individualized assessment, pose a national security risk, unmitigable flight risk, public safety threat, or who claim to be, are suspected to be, or are determined to be unaccompanied children as defined by 6 U.S.C. § 279(g)(2) or appear likely subject to the mandatory detention requirements of INA § 236(c), 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), if processed for removal proceedings pursuant to INA § 240, 8 U.S.C. § 1229a.

Subsequent Processing

CBP and ICE will equally share responsibility and work jointly to streamline and complete charging document issuance for individuals processed via Parole with Conditions. The final processing and placement into removal proceedings pursuant to INA § 240, 8 U.S.C. § 1229a is expected to utilize the standard processing, regardless of whether that paperwork occurs as a part of the Parole with Conditions processing or another pathway.

CBP is closely coordinating with ICE on this policy to ensure appropriate communication regarding those CBP is processing via Parole with Conditions and will be jointly responsible for the same. CBP understands that noncitizens will either check in with ICE for an NTA or receive an NTA by mail, upon request. CBP also understands that in circumstances in which DHS processes noncitizens for Parole with Conditions, DHS will make a separate, independent determination, after processing the individual for appropriate removal proceedings, whether to release the individual on parole during the pendency of such proceedings.

CBP must notify ICE in writing each time Parole with Conditions is authorized in a sector, with information regarding data and statistics. Such notification must occur before processing for Parole with Conditions begins in the authorized border sector(s).

CBP will continuously coordinate with ICE and understands that ICE will be issuing guidance to its operators based on this policy in the near term.

This policy, which may be modified, superseded, or rescinded at any time without notice, is for CBP internal use only and is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, by any party. Moreover, as a general statement of policy and agency organization, procedure, or practice, this policy is not subject to the Administrative Procedure Act's requirement of notice and comment.¹ But, even if it were, the

¹ 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)(A).

Policy on Parole with Conditions

Page 7

situations in certain sectors are quickly evolving into exigent circumstances, constituting good cause for bypassing notice and comment rulemaking, as contrary to the public interest.²

Encounters reached an all-time high of 2.2 million for noncitizens attempting to cross the SWB between ports of entry and without authorization in Fiscal Year 2022 and remain extremely high. The health, safety, and security of noncitizens in USBP custody is paramount to USBP's ability to effectively carry out its mission to secure the border, which in turn is important to protecting public safety. Moreover, on Thursday, May 11, 2023, at 23:59 ET, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Title 42 public health Order will end. For the past 7 days, USBP has averaged over 8,750 encounters per day. This is over double the average daily encounters of 4,285 in May of 2019, the highest month of the 2019 surge. Even with significant personnel along the SWB, a significant detention capacity, and interagency resources supporting the effort, this situation requires urgent action.

cc: Corey Price, Executive Associate Director, ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations

² 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)(B); *see also Jifry v. F.A.A.*, 370 F.3d 1174, 1179-80 (D.C. Cir. 2004); *Haw. Helicopters Operators Ass'n v. F.A.A.*, 51 F.3d 212, 214 (9th Cir. 1995).

**United States District Court
Southern District of Texas
Victoria Division**

STATE OF TEXAS, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case 6:23-cv-00007

**ORDER GRANTING LEAVE
TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT**

Came on for consideration the Plaintiffs' Expedited Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Complaint filed herein on May 12, 2023, and the Court having considered the same and finding that that the proposed Plaintiffs' Supplemental Complaint sets forth transactions, occurrences, or events that have happened since the date of the pleading to be supplemented; that such leave may be granted in the interest of justice in accordance with Rule 15(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on terms that are not prejudicial to Defendants and on reasonable notice, it is therefore

ORDERED that Plaintiffs are hereby granted leave pursuant to Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to file Plaintiffs' Supplemental Complaint herein, and the Clerk of this Court is directed to do so; and it is further

ORDERED that the date for Defendants to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs' Supplemental Complaint is extended to the same date within which Defendants must answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint herein, and the Court's Scheduling Order shall remain in effect as to all claims and matters set forth in the Amended Complaint pending further order of this Court, and the parties shall confer as to a proposed Scheduling Order as to the claims and matters set forth in Plaintiffs' Supplemental Complaint and report to the Court the results of such conference.

SIGNED this _____ day of May 2023.

United States District Court
Southern District of Texas
Victoria Division

STATE OF TEXAS, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case 6:23-cv-7

**PLAINTIFFS' EXPEDITED MOTION
FOR LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT COMPLAINT**

Texas moves for leave to file a supplemental complaint, which is attached as Exhibit A. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(d). There is good cause for the Court to grant it.

At the core of this suit is the Defendants' authority under the Immigration and Naturalization Act to adopt and implement policies to parole illegal aliens into the United States. The live complaint currently addresses the Defendants' recently adopted program for paroling into the United States up to 30,000 illegal immigrants per month from each of Cuba, Venezuela, Haiti, and Nicaragua, which violates Section 212(d)(5) of the INA, 5 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5), by granting paroles *en masse* rather than on a case-by-case determination that the parole of each individual is for urgent humanitarian reasons or will result in a significant public benefit. The Court consolidated the States' request for a preliminary injunction with the merits of their challenge to that program; trial is set for June 15.

In the meantime, however, the Defendants have adopted another program, which they refer to as Parole with Conditions, that exceeds their parole authority. In a May 10 memo, Defendant U.S. Customs and Border Protection, acting through its Border Patrol component, announced a new program granting *en masse* parole into the United States to illegal aliens arriving at the Southwest Border, again without the

case-by-case showing of individualized urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit required by Congress. More, these illegal aliens will not even have removal proceedings begun against them through the issuance of a Notice to Appear at an immigration-court setting. Rather, they are released into the United States after giving a mailing address and a promise to either appear at an Immigrations and Customs Enforcement facility within 60 days to request a Notice to Appear or to request one by mail. The memo set the program to begin at midnight Eastern time today—that is, contemporaneously with yesterday’s expiration of the CDC’s Title 42 public-health order at 11:59 p.m.

The Parole with Conditions program will immediately and irreparably harm the Texas and its co-plaintiff States, flooding them with yet more illegal aliens to add to the educational expenses, unemployment benefits, costs of incarceration, emergency Medicaid, and other costs they already bear as the result of Defendants’ unlawful releases. The announcement, implementation, and operation of the program are “transactions or occurrences or events which have happened since the date of the” Amended Complaint which the States may bring forth “on reasonable notice and on such terms as are just[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(d). The Supplemental Complaint, proposed to be filed fewer than 48 hours after the Defendants issued their policy memo and only hours after their new program’s scheduled start, meets those conditions, and the Court should grant leave for it to be filed.

Texas does not seek by the proposed Supplemental Complaint to disrupt or alter the current scheduling order, including the June 15 trial on the special four-nation parole program challenged in the Amended Complaint. Because the legality of both programs depends on the scope of the Defendants’ authority under Section 212(d)(5) of the INA, the supplemental claims can be tried with the currently live claims. In the alternative, Texas will confer with Defendants to propose a Supplemental Scheduling Order to govern whatever additional proceedings may be necessary.

CONCLUSION AND PRAYER

Texas respectfully requests that the Court consider this motion on an expedited basis and, after doing so, grant leave to file the proposed Supplemental Complaint.

Dated May 12, 2023.

Respectfully submitted.

KEN PAXTON
Attorney General of Texas

BRENT WEBSTER
First Assistant Attorney General

GRANT DORFMAN
Deputy First Assistant Attorney
General

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
(512) 463-1700

AARON F. REITZ
Lead Counsel
Deputy Attorney General for Legal Strategy
Texas Bar No. 24105704
Southern District of Texas No. 3653771
aaron.reitz@oag.texas.gov

/s/ Leif A. Olson
LEIF A. OLSON
Chief, Special Litigation Division
Texas Bar No. 24032801
Southern District of Texas No. 33695
leif.olson@oag.texas.gov

RYAN D. WALTERS
Special Counsel
Texas Bar No. 24105085
Southern District of Texas No. 3369185
ryan.walters@oag.texas.gov

DAVID BRYANT
Special Counsel
Texas Bar No. 03281500
Southern District of Texas No. 808332
david.bryant@oag.texas.gov

GENE P. HAMILTON
America First Legal Foundation
Virginia Bar No. 80434
Southern District of Texas No. 3792762
300 Independence Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 964-3721
gene.hamilton@aflegal.org

Counsel for the State of Texas

STEVE MARSHALL
Alabama Attorney General
EDMUND G. LACOUR JR.
Solicitor General
Office of the Attorney General
State of Alabama
501 Washington Avenue
P.O. Box 300152
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-0152
Tel: (334) 242-7300
Edmund.LaCour@AlabamaAG.gov

Counsel for the State of Alabama

BRENNA BIRD
Attorney General of Iowa
ERIC H. WESSAN
Solicitor General
1305 E. Walnut Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Tel: (515) 281-5164
Fax: (515) 281-4209
eric.wessan@ag.iowa.gov

Counsel for the State of Iowa

DANIEL CAMERON
Attorney General of Kentucky
MARC MANLEY
Associate Attorney General
Kentucky Office of the Attorney General
700 Capital Avenue, Suite 118
Frankfort, Kentucky
Tel: (502) 696-5478

Counsel for the Commonwealth of Kentucky

TIM GRIFFIN
Arkansas Attorney General
NICHOLAS J. BRONNI
Arkansas Solicitor General
HANNAH L. TEMPLIN
Assistant Solicitor General
Office of the Arkansas Attorney
General
323 Center Street, Suite 200
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
Counsel for the State of Arkansas

KRIS KOBACH
Attorney General of Kansas
JESSE A. BURRIS, Kan. Sup. Ct.
#26856
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Kansas Attorney General
120 SW 10th Avenue, 2nd Floor
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1597
Tel: (785) 368-8197
Jesse.Burris@ag.ks.gov

Counsel for the State of Kansas

JEFF LANDRY
Attorney General of Louisiana
ELIZABETH B. MURRILL (La #20685)
Solicitor General
JOSEPH SCOTT ST. JOHN (La #36682)
Deputy Solicitor General
Louisiana Department of Justice
1885 N. Third Street
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
Tel: (225) 326-6766
murrille@ag.louisiana.gov
stjohnj@ag.louisiana.gov

Counsel for the State of Louisiana

LYNN FITCH
Attorney General of Mississippi
JUSTIN L. MATHENY
Deputy Solicitor General
Office of the Mississippi Attorney General
P.O. Box 220
Jackson, MS 39205-0220
Tel: (601) 359-3680
justin.matheny@ago.ms.gov
Counsel for the State of Mississippi

DAVE YOST
Ohio Attorney General
SYLVIA MAY MAILMAN
Ohio Deputy Solicitor General
30 E. Broad St., 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
Tel: (614) 466-8980
May.Mailman@OhioAGO.gov
Counsel for the State of Ohio

JONATHAN SKRMETTI
Tennessee Attorney General
and Reporter
CLARK L. HILDABRAND
Assistant Solicitor General
P.O. Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202
Tel: (615) 253-5642
Clark.Hildabrand@ag.tn.gov
Counsel for the State of Tennessee

ANDREW BAILEY
Attorney General of Missouri
JOSHUA M. DIVINE, Mo. Bar #69875
Solicitor General
CHARLES F. CAPPS, Mo. Bar #72734
Deputy Solicitor General
Missouri Attorney General's Office
Post Office Box 899
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
Tel: (573) 751-8870
Josh.Divine@ago.mo.gov
Counsel for the State of Missouri

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General of South Carolina
THOMAS T. HYDRICK
Assistant Deputy Solicitor General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211
Tel: (803) 734-4127
thomashydrick@scag.gov
Counsel for the State of South Carolina

PATRICK MORRISEY
Attorney General of West Virginia
LINDSAY SEE
Solicitor General
MICHAEL R. WILLIAMS
Senior Deputy Solicitor General
Office of the West Virginia
Attorney General
State Capitol, Bldg 1, Room E-26
Charleston, WV 25305
Tel: (681) 313-4550
Lindsay.S.See@wvago.gov
Michael.R.Williams@wvago.gov
Counsel for the State of West Virginia

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

On May 12, 2023, and Erez Reuveni, counsel for the Defendants, informed Texas's counsel that the Defendants oppose this motion. We did not receive a response from counsel for the Defendant-Intervenors before filing.

/s/ Leif A. Olson

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on May 12, 2023, this was filed through the Court's CM/ECF system, which served it upon all counsel of record.

/s/ Leif A. Olson